



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,866	04/05/2006	Jorgen J.L. Hoppenbrouwers	GB030184US1	2099
24737	7590	09/15/2011		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS				
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
SAD/O, INSA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com

debbie.henn@philips.com

marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/572,866

Applicant(s)

HOPPENBROUWERS ET AL.

Examiner

INSA SADIO

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-850)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 filed on 06/13/2011 has been considered by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. **Claims 1, 2, 4-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanauchi et al. (US Publication number 2003/0197472), hereinafter referenced as Kanauchi, in view of Morita (US Publication Number 2002/0196241), and further in view of Ohta et al. (US Publication Number 2007/0033278), hereinafter referenced as Ohta.

As of claim 1, Kanauchi discloses Drive unit and drive method of light-emitting display panel. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said a method of illuminating an active matrix electroluminescent display device comprising an array of display pixels arranged in rows and columns, the method comprising acts of, at any point in time, [simultaneously] illuminating a plurality of rows of pixels, the plurality of [simultaneously] illuminated rows of pixels defining at least two bands separated by a band formed of non-illuminated row of pixels (see [0072], fig. 12).

Kanauchi does not teach wherein said **the at least two bands scrolling in the column direction over time such that they simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time; and displaying image data for different frames of video in different of the at least two bands so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed at any one time, wherein at most 75% of the rows of pixels are illuminated at any point in time.**

However, Morita teaches the at least two bands scrolling in the column direction over time such that they simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time; and displaying image data for different frames of video in different of the at least two bands so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed at any one time, wherein at most 75% of the rows of pixels are illuminated at any point in time (see fig. 8B, fig. 8C).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi's drive method with the teaching of Morita's scan-drive circuit to display images, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

Kanauchi as modified by Morita does not teach wherein said simultaneously illuminating row of pixels.

However, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention(see [0105], [0106]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi as modified by Morita's drive method with

the teaching of Ohta's scanning system to illuminate rows at the same time, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

As of claim 2, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said each each of the at least two bands comprises a plurality of adjacent rows of pixels (see paragraph [0072], display region).

As of claim 4, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said each of the at least two bands comprises a plurality of sequential alternate rows of pixels (see paragraph [0072], [0073]).

As of claim 5, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Morita teaches wherein said one of the at least two bands comprises only odd rows and another of the at least two bands comprises only even rows (see paragraph [0193], [0213]).

As of claim 6, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said at most 50% of the rows are illuminated at any point in time (see paragraphs [0072], [0074], (equivalent to partial display)).

As of claim 7, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 6 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said at most 30% of the rows are illuminated at any point in time (see paragraphs [0072], [0074], (equivalent to partial display)).

As of claim 8, Kanauchi discloses Drive unit and drive method of light-emitting display panel. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said An active matrix electroluminescent display device comprising: an array of display pixels arranged in rows and columns, and row driver circuitry for illuminating a plurality of rows of pixels (see Fig. 5), the I plurality of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels forming at least two bands separated by a band formed of non-illuminated rows of pixels, the row driver circuitry illuminating each row of pixels for at most 75% of a frame period (see Fig. 12); wherein the at least two bands scroll in the column direction over time, and image data for different frames of video is displayed in different ones of the at least two bands so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed at any one time (see Fig. 12).

Kanauchi does not teach wherein said "...such that they simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time."

However, Morita teaches wherein said "...such that they simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time." (see fig. 8B, fig. 8C).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi's drive method with the teaching of Morita's scan-drive circuit to display images, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

Kanauchi as modified by Morita does not teach wherein said **simultaneously illuminating row of pixels**.

However, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention (see [0105], [0106]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi as modified by Morita's drive method with the teaching of Ohta's scanning system to illuminate rows at the same time, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

As of claim 9, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 8 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said further comprising a frame buffer for storing image data (see Fig. 2 [data driver]).

As of claim 10, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 8 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said the frame buffer stores an amount of data corresponding to a single frame of image data (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

As of claim 11, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 10 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said data is written into the frame buffer progressively frame by frame in sequence, such the frame buffer stores partial data for two adjacent frames, and wherein data is read out from the frame buffer at two locations simultaneously (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

As of claim 12, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 10 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said the two locations include data from different adjacent frames of image data (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/03/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6 of Applicant's arguments, Applicant's argues that It is further undisputed that Kanauchi and Morita do not teach "simultaneously illuminating a plurality of rows of pixels, the plurality of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels forming at least two bands separated by a band formed of non- illuminated plurality of rows of pixels", as in amended claim 1. However, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion. Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention (see [0105], [0106]).

On page 6 and 7 of Applicant's arguments, Applicant's argues that It is respectfully submitted that these descriptions and the rest of Ohta for that matter do not teach, disclose, or suggest "displaying image data for different frames of video in different of the at least two bands." However, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion. Kanauchi teaches "displaying image data for different frames of video in different of the at least two bands"(see fig. 8B, fig. 8C).`

On page 7 and 8 of Applicant's arguments, Applicant's argues that
It is respectfully submitted that the referenced paragraphs and the rest of Kanauchi for that matter does not teach, disclose, or suggest the frame buffer that "stores partial image data for two adjacent frames, and wherein data is read out from the frame buffer at two locations simultaneously", as for example recited in claim 11. However, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion (see Fig. 12).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to INSA SADIO whose telephone number is (571)270-5580. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY through FRIDAY 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LunYi Lao can be reached on 571-272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/INSA SADIO/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/LUN-YI LAO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629